DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 952 24 HE 001 601

AUTHOR Morris, Glenda Mary
TITLE A Study of Psychological and Social Factors for Sorority Women and Residence Hall Women at Oklahoma State University. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma State Univ., Stillwater.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-8-G-011
PUB DATE May 70
GRANT OEG-7-8-00011-0036-010
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
DESCRIPTORS *College Attendance, College Students, *Higher Education, Interpersonal Relationship, *Student College Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Oklahoma State University

ABSTRACT

Because college attrition is higher for independent women than it is for sorority women, regardless of aptitude and academic standing, this study was initiated to examine psychological and social differences between the two groups. Characteristics under investigation include interpersonal values, open-mindedness, academic aptitude, academic achievement, career-marriage plans, participation in extra-curricular activities, factors contributing to campus prestige, and socio-economic status of parents. High school data regarding size of graduating class, grade point average, and extra-curricular activities are also considered. Research methodology and population samples are discussed; findings are summarized at the conclusion of the study. (Author/NF)

ED038952

BR-8-G-011
PA 24

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-G-011
Grant No. OEG-7-8-000011-0036-010

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS FOR SORORITY WOMEN AND RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 1970

Mary Glenda Morris
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

HE001 601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Objectives	2
Review of Literature	3
Theoretical Background	7
Limitations of the Study	14
Assumptions of the Study	14
Residence Hall and Sorority Living at Oklahoma State University	15
Hypotheses	16
Methodology and Design	17
Instrumentation	21
Findings	28
Bibliography	39

A STUDY OF SELECTED PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS FOR SORORITY WOMEN AND RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

In the fall of 1962 the Board of Regents of the state of Oklahoma began a longitudinal study of freshman classes entering the state's institutions of higher education (2). At the end of the first year the study revealed that seven out of ten women students who dropped out of colleges were achieving satisfactory academic standing. At a period of time when stress is being placed on maximum use of human resources these findings raise both question and concern as to why academically capable young women do not continue their formal education.

A survey of the 1960 class of freshman women at Oklahoma State University which was conducted by the Dean of Women's Office indicated that of those who graduated over 50% were sorority women although the total number of sorority women comprised less than 33% of the women's enrollment.

Collins and Whetstone's comparison of sorority and independent women showed that attrition is higher for independent women than sorority women, regardless of aptitude (3).

When students involved in a study at Berkeley and Stanford were asked what three organizations have been most important to them, those belonging to fraternities and sororities nearly always named that group (16).

There is an indication that to those involved in a sorority the sorority is important to them. There is also some evidence that a higher percentage of sorority women complete college than those who are not affiliated with such an organization. It therefore appears that further investigation of sorority women and residence hall women, the largest group of single women students on campus, might provide insights in similarity and differences between the two groups. The educational significance of such a study lies primarily in contributing to the knowledge of what these two groups of college women are like while they are in college. Hopefully, such data would provide additional understandings of why some college women persist and some do not.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine selected psychological and social differences between sorority women and residence hall women.

Those factors being studied include interpersonal values, open-mindedness, academic aptitude, academic achievement, career-marriage plans, participation in extra-curricular activities, factors which one feels contribute to campus and prestige, socio-economic status of parents.

High school data regarding size of graduating class, grade point average, and extra-curricular activities will also be considered.

Objectives

In relationship to the above-mentioned factors the following questions are raised.

1. Do freshman women students who pledge a sorority differ from the majority of freshman women living in university residence halls who indicate no interest in pledging at the time they enter college? <u>At the end of the year</u>?*

2. Do any significant changes take place within these two groups during the course of the first year?

3. If each of the groups was compared to an upperclass counterpart (freshman pledges and sorority members, freshman and junior residence hall women) what similarities and differences would exist at the beginning of the year and <u>at the end of the year</u>.*

In selecting a group of sorority members and a group of residence hall women which each of the freshman groups could be compared against, the findings of the study conducted at Vassar and of Scott's study of fraternities and sororities at the University of Colorado were most influential. Primarily on the basis of these studies the decision was made to select a group of juniors from each of the two types of living situations. It was pointed out in the Vassar study that while the senior is still within the college community she is now being subjected to pressures from outside the college environment. The senior may begin to question whether or not the "new identity" she has developed will be adequate when she is thrust into the world.

In contrast the junior year may be the most satisfying in that while there is the greatest opportunity for differentiation of role

*This was not included in the statement of hypotheses.

and function, there is also the greatest degree of order and security. The junior group, held together in shared experiences and common values, are "chief heirs and transmitters of culture." (28)

Scott found the sororities involved in his study to be primarily maintained by the juniors in the house.

It appears that if any group would most reflect a specific set of values and attitudes it would be the juniors.

Review of the Literature

The Freshman Year

The longitudinal study conducted by Sanford, Freedman, Webster and Brown at Vassar on personality development during the college years reveals the uniqueness of each year of college (28). During the freshman year the greatest anxiety of the student is not as a result of the intellectual aims but rather it is created over concern of acceptance by peers. The first year is found to provide the "basic orientation to the college" thus it is during this period that enduring habits and values are being formed. The central core of values are learned or assimilated through experiences other than those of the formal academic nature.

Freshmen, according to Yoshino (40), are immature in a number of ways and need guidance and support from their families, instructors, and upperclassmen. Most have high hopes and aspirations when they first arrive on campus.

Fifty freshman students were interviewed as part of a longitudinal study at Michigan State University (5). Their major concerns centered upon making friends, being accepted, maintaining individuality, adjusting to campus mores and performing successfully in their academic pursuits.

In a study involving Stanford and Berkeley students, (16) freshman women were asked the question, "If you were advising an entering freshman girl about the first year of college, what would you tell her?" The main thing pointed out was the tremendous social pressure which is placed on a freshman girl.

When the freshmen arrive on campus the majority seem to conform to the behavior and expectations of their own family.

Changes that May Occur During the College Years

Lehmann and Dressel (4) state:

> Although it is generally agreed that attitudes and values are instilled early in life and are most easily modifiable in infancy and adolescence, curriculum planning at our colleges and universities assumes that the critical thinking abilities, attitudes, and values of college students are still modifiable at the age of 18 to 22 or older. (p. 22)

Their longitudinal study indicated a lessening of stereotype beliefs from the freshman to senior years. In other words, they become more flexible, less rigid and less authoritarian during their four years at college.

It appeared that females underwent a more marked change than the males during this period. Females tended to be more oriented to conformity and sociability ... to do things to please others both at the beginning and at the end of college. Females also tended to be more "outer or other directed." In addition, they appeared to be more open-minded and receptive to new ideas than were males.

The greatest magnitude of change occurred during the freshman and sophomore years. In addition to changing to a greater degree, females also are more susceptible to early change.

Plant's study of personality change in college (21) indicated a decrease in ethnocentrism, authoritarianism and dogmatism occurred in the college student; however, a retest of those persons who aspired to go to college but did not enroll revealed they too made the same change in the same direction. The net change in the non-student was not as great as in the college student. Plant's study supports the idea that the greatest change appears to take place sometime during the first two years. It also indicated the net amount of shift was slightly greater for females than males.

During the thirties Newcomb undertook a study at Bennington College (33) which showed a shift from conservative to liberal attitudes over the four-year period.

Bugelski and Lester attributed changes in attitudes in a group of college students during college and after graduation to the general college experience. Attitude scales included areas of national and social optimism, labor problems, economic status, discipline, social life and conventions and religion. Significant change from scales indicated shift in scores from conservative to liberal ones.

Eddy's approach to studying the college influence on student character used the participant-observer approach and formal open-minded interviews in collecting data from twenty American colleges and universities in a one-year period (6). Character is defined as "intelligent direction and purposeful control of conduct by definite moral principles." (p.2)

Pertinent findings and conclusions report that if the student has a sense of belonging and a feeling of security, his outlook and attitudes may change resulting in his being more "receptive to the process

and possibilities of education." The value of the group living experience depends to a great part upon the quality of adult leadership available.

Studies consistently reveal the importance of personal relations upon the student. For example Lehmann and Dressel (4) report that in general, students feel that the most significant thing that has happened to them is learning to get along with all types of people and that the most significant experience in their collegiate lives has been their association with differing personalities in their living groups. The data suggests that small group discussions and bull sessions had a significant impact in shaking the attitudes and values of this particular group of students.

Based upon a study of the effect of general education received through the social sciences upon the value of the American college students, Jacob (15) concluded that changes in fundamental values are slight although the student may modify opinions and attitudes, learn to tolerate and get along with persons much different from himself and may become more self-reliant. Jacob reports that changes such as a shift from diversity to uniformity do take place and that the results of such shifts or changes tend to bring the student around to having "the college outlook." As he progresses through college he becomes more critical of parents and family, laws and rules, more liberal in religious views, more condoning of unconventional social practices, less dogmatic, develops increased flexibility of belief and more permissive in human relations. Jacob says these are all "surface changes" and do not actually involve the fundamental values which are a major part of personality. Effects are dependent upon the personality and psychological needs of the individual students.

Studies Concerning Differences Between Those Who Pledge and Those Who Do Not

Scott's (31) intensive study of personal values in sororities and fraternities revealed that freshmen at the time of pledging placed a higher value on group loyalty and on social skills and a lower value on independence. As a group, sorority pledges increased on the values of intellectualism and independence and decreased on the value of loyalty. For the most part changes in values were not significantly different from non-pledging women over the same period of time.

Plant's (22) study at San Jose State College also indicated that sorority members become less ethnocentric, authoritarian and dogmatic just as all women students do.

A comparison of pledges, and independents made by Jackson and Winkler (14) suggests that pledges differ from non-pledges on a number of characteristic values and expectations. These differences for female pledges include fewer needs for introspection and empathy, a complaisant regard for another's wishes, and more need for heterosexual relationships.

Differences were investigated between fraternity and sorority aspirants and non-aspirants by Widmar (39).

Differences in secondary school experiences indicated sorority aspirants were more active socially and participated to a greater extent in school activities while non-aspirants perceived themselves as having achieved higher academically and in fact had higher scores on the SCAT. Sorority aspirants came from a higher social, economic and cultural stratum than non-aspirants. Aspirants tended to come from smaller families where the educational level, cultural participation and parental concern were significantly higher. Sorority aspirants planned to participate more in extracurricular and social activities while measures of self-perception indicated non-aspirants tended to be less concerned with social and extracurricular sphere of college life and to place more emphasis on academic and vocational concerns. They also perceived themselves as being more independent and less conforming than did sorority aspirants.

Lehmann and Dressel's study (4) indicated that as far as students were concerned the advantages of sorority affiliation centered mostly around social advantages. Few felt they had been changed by the sorority experience.

Application of the Reference Group Concept

In reporting the findings of change in attitude from conservative to liberal, Newcomb relates change to reference group. For those who did change in attitude it was determined that the college community had become a reference group thereby providing "a sense of belongingness and a sense of status and achievement during their college years." Those who did not change in attitude found the sense of belongingness through persons and groups outside the college community.

Brown and Bystryn (33) provide further information on the reference group concept. Their study of college environment, personality and social ideology of three ethnic groups indicated an average decrease in authoritarianism at both liberal arts colleges but not at the university. The greatest degree of change was evidenced among the Jewish students at the small eastern liberal arts college. It was hypothesized that the Jewish group was placed in an environment which necessitated the greatest change as the majority came from Jewish neighborhoods and upon entering the college became for the first time a member of a minority group. In order to be accepted they tended to make the college their reference group thus assimilating the social ideology of the group.

"Personal and social components associated with the acceptance of new groups as reference groups" served as the basis for an exploratory program of studies. Ruth Hartley reported on several aspects of the study (10,11,12).

The subjects involved in the study included 146 unselected male freshmen. The college community of the urban tuition-free college served as reference group.

The hypothesis was confirmed "that the greater the compatability between the articulated values of the individual and the perceived values of the new group, the more likely the individual is to accept the new group as a reference group."

In another report the findings indicated "that the absolute level of the ability of a given group to fulfill the needs of its members is more significant than its comparative standing in this respect in relation to other membership groups" (3).

A third study supported the hypothesis that "preference for the norms of the new group was positively associated with acceptance of it as a reference group" (1). Correlations indicated "that perceptions of relatively large differences in norms between established groups and the new group were associated with relatively less acceptance of the new group as a reference group" (2).

Theoretical Background

In considering the college student and what happens to him after he arrives on the college Lehmann and Dressel (4) state that a pre-test of values and attitudes measures what a student brings with him to the college experience. The post-test should measure what he gains after he gets there.

The college student brings with him to the college situation approximately 18 years of living, during which time he has had to continually adapt and adjust to the social organization in which he was born. In order to understand the college student and the effects the college experience might have on him it is necessary to have an understanding of what has occurred during those eighteen years. Who andwhat have had effects upon him. The basis is then how personality develops and changes. Harry S. Sullivan's interpersonal theory of personality development will be used to provide a basis for personality development (36).

Sullivan defines personality as "the enduring pattern of recurrent interpersonal situations which characterize a human life" (p. 103). He conceives of the personality developing unequally as the individual progresses through the following developmental stage: infancy, childhood, juvenile, pre-adolescence, adolescence and post-adolescence.

While Sullivan discusses to a great extent the biological system of the newborn the focus in this summary of personality development will focus upon significant interpersonal relationships which occur during the various stages.

From birth the infant will have continuous contact with others and will order his activities in such a way as is necessary to maintain his existence. The growth and development of the child is the result of the learning process which coincides with the level of maturation of the child. Learning as defined by Sullivan is the organization of experiences; experience being defined as "anything lived, undergone or the like." He felt the anxiety to be one of the greatest educative forces (p. 52). Learning may also take place through trial and success, trial and error, rewards and punishments, human examples and education ("pulling out of relationships"[p. 54]).

Within the personal environment of the infant the first significant person is the mother or mothering one. The infant's relationship with its mother is significant in that it sets a love for further relationships. During infancy personifications which are based upon the infant's perceptions are beginning to form. For instance, the infant's personification of mother may be that of "good" mother or "bad" mother depending upon her pattern of participation in the interpersonal situation. While the mother is the first socializing agent others in the family become involved in the interpersonal environment of the child.

During infancy the self system, the personification of self, is beginning to form. Three phases of the personification of self include the good me, the organization of rewarding experiences, the bad me, the organization of anxiety situations involving the mothering one; the not me, the organization of experiences with significant people that involved intense and/or sudden anxiety which kept the individual from being able to grasp the particular situation. The self system serves as "an organization of educative experience called into being by the necessity to avoid or to minimize incidents of anxiety." (p. 165)

Childhood begins as the two divisions of interpersonal communicative behavior of language and gesture begin to form. As language becomes more organized the child is able to bring together phases of personifications. Mannerisms through trial and error are acquired and the interesting and potentially powerful force of "teachers by indifference" comes into play.

As the infant moves into childhood society begins to play a more significant part in the child's development. The family cannot portray more than their perceptions of society to the child.

The self-system continues to develop and change by virtue of the fact that personality evolves through the stages of development; however, it may be a lengthy and complex process. While the self system is fairly resistant to change, the greatest opportunity for change to occur is at the beginning of the various stages of development. The self-system tends not to be influenced by experiences which are incongruent with its current organization.

Problems may arise for the child during this stage if parents attempt to keep him an infant or if they assume he is willfully

troublesome. A confusing, frustrating situation may be created for the child if activities which, up to this point, have been acceptable, are no longer. In other words, the mother suddenly expects the child to have reached a level where he knows better. He is now being punished for things for which he does not understand why and under circumstances in which he could not possibly have foreseen the consequences. Such confusion and frustration may result in what Sullivan refers to as a "malevolent transformation." This concept is best illustrated by Sullivan's statement "Once upon a time everything was lovely, but that was before I had to deal with people."

From childhood the child moves into the juvenile stage which is characterized as the time for becoming social. This is a very important period as the child begins school and for the first time the "limitations and peculiarities of home "may be corrected or modified through the interactional process which now involves other socializing influences such as the school. While new authority figures such as teachers appear their authority has certain limitations. The variety of persons he encounters expands his knowledge of the variety of differences. Those most significant in the life of the juvenile are family, non-family authorities and compeers. In-groups and out-groups are being formed as well as stereotypes. The juvenile has the opportunity to see the interaction of the behavior of his peers and of the authority figures. The juvenile also begins to differentiate childhood authority figures, parents and others, as "simply people." Life becomes more complicated as the presence of more and more people are involved.

Two new classes of learning, competition and compromise are introduced primarily through the school's influence.

How development to this point affects adult life is best summed up by Sullivan in the following statement.

> Since there is no particular reason for anyone to try to bring into the juvenile's awareness how he arrived at these reformulations of behavior most of us come into adult life with a great many entrenched ways of dealing with our fellowman which we cannot adequately explain.

Beginning with the juvenile era the self-system "controls the content of consciousness." It is difficult to recall what went on during childhood unless it seems to be appropriate or early modifiable to the present. By the end of the juvenile era one has formulated an "orientation to living" which enables one to develop foresight which "governs the handling of intercurrent opportunities" (p. 244).

The focus of the preadolescence stage is the need for interpersonal intimacy; the need for the intimate relationship of a close friend or chum. It is actually the beginning of a feeling of love as the preadolescent begins to develop real sensitivity and feeling of concern as to what happens to another. Through this relationship the preadolescent is able to confirm his own feelings of self worth. It is through this first consensual validation of personal worth that many of the self-deceiving skills which have been developed are now rectified. Those

entering this stage whose personalities have been affected by the malevolent transformation may have a difficult time establishing this type of relationship; however, the need for intimacy is so great that the malevolent feeling may actually be reversed. Loneliness may be the significant experience if this need is not satisfied.

Maturation, the onset of which varies greatly, becomes conspicuous as the preadolescent moves toward puberty.

Early adolescence begins with the appearance of true genital interest and moves into the last phase of adolescence as a patterning of sexual behavior begins to take place.

During this stage the adolescent shift from satisfying the intimacy need through a relationship with someone like self to someone quite different--a member of the opposite sex. The difficulty in shift of the intimacy relationship is created by a lack of preparation for the change. This lack is a product of cultural influences.

Sullivan feels that late adolescence is marked by an achievement rather than biological maturation.

> Late adolescence extends from the patterning of preferred genital activity through unnumbered educative and educative steps to the establishment of a fully human or mature repertory of interpersonal relations as permitted by available opportunity, personal and cultural. (p. 297)

Unfortunately the outcome of the period may depend to a great degree upon the change factor. If the individual goes to a college or university he will be given the opportunity to come into contact with a variety of persons to become familiar with cultures other than his own, to participate in discussions centering around his new-found knowledge and observations and to relate past experiences to the new.

It should be noted that for those who do not attend college the same experience should occur with the possible exception of exposure to cultural interest. It is hoped that regardless of his situation the person in this stage continues his growth and development.

By this stage one must have developed respect for himself if he is to be respected by others.

As all the various aspects fall into their proper relationship one moves into adulthood. When one reaches adulthood, he is able to establish a love relationship with a person as significant or almost as significant as self.

Sanford points out that not enough attention has been given to young adulthood. To expand upon this stage, Robert White has defined five growth trends which take place during this period (38).

The direction of these growth trends both result from and contribute to the "naturalness of the individual."

> Each person is at least a little different from every other person with respect to constitutional and temperamental endowment, aptitudes and potential skills, a long history of learnings in the family and subsequent social systems, integration of these experiences to form a sense of identity, and actual life situation as defined by occupation, social position, marriage, and a host of other circumstances. (p. 372)

Growth Trend 1. The stabilizing of ego identity

> Ego identity refers to the self or the person one feels ones self to be.
>
> As the ego becomes increasingly more and more stable "accumulated experiences organized as an increasingly stable set of self-feeling and self-estimates, more and more outweighs the impact of new events."

Growth Trend 2. The feeling of personal relationships

> White states there is "a great deal to learn before one truly interacts with others in their own right as individuals."
>
> As one moves in this direction one develops a greater range and flexibility of responses, and becomes more responsive to another person's real nature thus becoming better able to "live in a real relationship" with those immediately around him.

Growth Trend 3. The deepening of interests

> Growth moves in this direction as one becomes involved in activities and reward comes from satisfaction of doing something for its own sake.

Growth Trend 4. The humanizing of values

> One's value system truly becomes one's own as this occurs:
>
> (1) the person increasingly discovers the human meaning of values and their relation to the achievement of social purposes.
>
> (2) he increasingly brings to bear his own experiences and his own motives in affirming and promoting a value system.

White points out the need for supplementing this trend with another that has been described by Allport as "moving toward a unifying philosophy of life.

Growth Trend 5. The expansion of caring

There is a movement toward "increased caring for the welfare of other persons and human concerns." (p. 401) The trend implies as deepening concern for social interests.

Sanford adds an additional growth trend: general development and strengthening of the ego (29). This underlies all the other trends and implies that one is able to move in certain directions.

The college student comes into the university environment during a time when growth is taking place. The decisions he makes are based upon what he brings with him, his past experience, his values, his needs, etc.

The decisions he will be called upon to make include what he will major in, where he will live, what he will become involved in, whom he will associate with.

Those decisions will be effected by what goes on within and outside the person.

The following proposition outlined by Sherif and Sherif contribute to the foundation for understanding how the individual interactions with his environment (pp. 77-83).

1. Experience and behavior constitute a unity.
2. Behavior follows central psychological structuring.
3. Psychological structuring is jointly determined by external and internal forces.
4. Internal forces (motives, attitudes, and so on) and experience are inferred from behavior.
5. The psychological tendency is toward structuring of experience.
6. Structured stimulus situations set limits to alternatives in psychological structuring.
7. In unstructured stimulus situations, alternatives in psychological structuring are increased.
8. The more unstructured the stimulus situation, the greater the relative contribution to internal factors in the frame of reference.
9. The more unstructured the stimulus situation, the greater the relative contribution of external social factors in the frame of reference.
10. Various factors in the frame of reference have differing relative weights.
11. Psychological activity is selective.

The concept of the reference group was created by Hyman (13) in an attempt to better understand individuals' opinions and attitudes. The approach taken was to find out how the individual viewed his statuses (the positions the individual occupies in a group) in relationship to the hierarchical system within the group and to other individuals. Those groups which the individual related to himself were designed as his "reference groups" and the individuals which he related himself

to were "reference individuals." Those statuses studies included social, intellectual, economic, cultural, looks, general, prestige.

It was found that an individual uses the reference group as an anchorage (that point from which an individual judges everything else in his perceptual field at a given time) from which to judge his status. It was also determined that the individual determines his standards and values in accord with the standards and values of his reference group.

The study indicated that the individual evaluates his status in accord with two types of reference groups.

1. Membership groups
2. Groups to which he aspires to have membership

The individual evaluates his status in relationship to his perceived status of the group in society. He uses the status of the group to evaluate his own status in relationship to other groups thus this group becomes an anchorage for the individual. When these two conditions, attitude formation and self-appraisal, exist--this membership group becomes a reference group for the individual.

A person may be a member of many groups, especially in such a complex society as the United States. Not all membership groups become reference groups for the individual. Those groups which satisfy the needs of the individual to the greatest extent have the greatest chance of becoming his reference groups.

Attitude formation and self-appraisal may take place not only through the groups with which the individual is identified but also through the identification of the individual to groups which he is not a member but desires to be identified with. Hyman found that reference groups tend to be smaller groups with which the individual is more apt to have stronger emotional bonds.

Sherif (33) placed a good deal of emphasis on the concept of "reference group" in the 1948 edition of his text in social psychology. Sherif defines the group "as a social unit which consists of a number of individuals who stand in (more or less) definite status and role relationships to one another and which possesses a set of values or norms of its own, regulating the behavior of the individual members, at least in matters of consequence to the group." (p. 144) He defines reference groups as "those groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically." (p. 175)

The values and attitudes of a group might change due to various internal and external forces. The changes may prohibit the group from meeting the needs of the individual, thus weakening the emotional mutuality between the individual and the group. The individual, as a result, may shift reference groups thus relocating himself in a hierarchical system.

Maintaining persons in a group when the bond begins to weaken could have dysfunctional consequence to the group in that the stability of the group would be weakened.

Limitations of the Study

1. The samples used in this study come from selected populations within the total university population, therefore, findings are limited only to those populations being studied.

2. This study limits its scope to stratified samples. While it is recognized that differences may exist between the various residence halls, the results of this study could not be generalized for a particular housing group.

3. The number of variables being studied is limited, therefore, it is recognized this can only represent a partial study of the differences between these populations.

4. The freshman sorority women do not live in sorority houses, therefore, limiting the amount of contact with the sorority during the freshman year.

5. It is recognized that some living in the residence halls may pledge some time during their college career or may desire to be a member of a sorority but may not be able to do so for various reasons such as finances, grade point average, etc.

6. Limitations of a cross-sectional approach are recognized.

7. As the testing could not be done before the semester began, it recognized the initial effects are not controlled.

Assumptions of the Study

1. The university is concerned with the development of the whole person.

2. The university may be viewed as a social system which is divided into subsystems. Differences may exist between members of these subsystems.

3. Within the college environment are various elements which facilitate changes taking place within the individual.

4. Peer group relationships will be formed within each type of living group.

5. It is assumed that those persons who are included in the sample of sorority women desired to be a member of a social sorority

and that those included in the residence hall sample desired to live in a residence hall.

6. The assumption is made that the population of juniors as freshmen would have had approximately the same characteristics as the freshman population being studied.

Residence Hall and Sorority Living at Oklahoma State University

All freshman women students attending the University are required to live in university housing with the following exceptions:

a. those living at home or with relatives
b. those commuting
c. those over 23 years of age

Hall and room assignments are made by Housing Office staff members. Requests for halls and roommates are honored when possible.

As a result of the housing regulations and the way in which assignments are made sorority pledges are housed in each of the various units. Their roommate may or may not be affiliated with a sorority and may be of any classification.

Sorority pledges who have been initiated or will be initiated during the fall semester move into their respective sorority houses and will live there for three years.

Hall residents have priority when requesting hall and room assignments. Priorities are met according to classification; therefore, it is possible for a resident to change halls every year and to change rooms and roommates more frequently than that.

Since sorority members move into the house at the beginning of the sophomore year, it was decided to select juniors who had lived in the house since the first semester of the sophomore year and to select hall residents who had been in the same hall for a like period of time.

The residence halls include residence halls for women and co-educational complexes. The programs vary from hall to hall. All have active student governments, social functions, educational programs, intramural sports programs and scholarship programs.

Sorority pledges may take part in any hall activity and may hold a floor or hall office.

Sorority pledges are involved in activities with the chapter which average 21 to 35 hours per week. This includes 12-25 hours for study. All houses have a big sister-little sister program.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant differences in interpersonal values and open-mindedness between

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women at the time they enter the university

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

   d. freshman and junior residence hall women

2. There will be no significant change in interpersonal values and open-mindedness over the academic year for freshman sorority women and for freshman residence hall women.

3. There will be no significant difference between the academic aptitude of

   a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

4. There will be no significant differences between college grade point averages for

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women as based on the first semester grade average

   b. junior sorority women and juniors residence hall women as based on their overall grade point average through the first semester of the junior year

5. Career-marriage plans will not be significantly different between

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

   d. freshman residence hall women and junior residence hall women

6. Participation in extra-curricular activities will not differ significantly between

   a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

7. There will be no significant differences between the following groups on factors which they feel lead to high prestige of students

   a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

8. Freshman sorority women will not differ significantly from freshman residence hall women on

   a. size of high school graduating class

   b. high school grade point average

   c. participation in high school activities

9. There will be no significant differences on parents' educational level, family income and prestige of father's occupation between the following groups

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

   d. freshman residence hall women and junior residence hall women

Methodology and Design

The focus of this chapter is a detailed description of the design of the study, methods of collecting data, the instruments used, populations from which the subjects were selected and the statistical procedures used to test the hypotheses.

Population

The populations being students consisted of the following:

(a) single women students who were freshman during the 1967-68 academic year and who

   1. attended formal fall rush and pledged a national panhellenic sorority and who lived in a university residence hall.

   2. live in a university residence but were not affiliated with a panhellenic sorority and who did not register to attend fall rush.

(b) single women students who were juniors during the 1967-68 academic year, having entered the Oklahoma State University as freshmen in the fall of 1965 and have attended Oklahoma State University each fall and spring term since their entrance and who

1. are members of sororities, having pledged in the fall of 1965 and are living in their respective sorority houses.

2. live in an Oklahoma State University residence hall, having lived there since the fall of their sophomore year and who have never been affiliated with a panhellenic sorority nor completed an application to attend formal or informal rush.

Each residence hall and each sorority is represented according to the percentage of subjects in their group meeting the specified criteria. No specific numbers participating in the study from each group are reported in order that no group's representation may be identified.

All those in the original samples of freshman who had completed all the test information and who were enrolled second semester were contacted to participate in a re-test.

Sample

The samples drawn from each of the above groups were selected through a table of random numbers. Each residence hall and each sorority was represented on a proportional basis.

The freshman sorority pledges were drawn from those names appearing on the sorority bid lists who met the criteria of the population as defined above.

The second week of the fall semester the rosters from each of the residence halls were received in the Dean of Women's Office. Those women students who met the criteria of the population were identified.

The populations for the junior women were identified through the residence hall rosters and sorority membership lists which were submitted to the Dean of Women's Office the second week of the spring semester. Previous rosters and lists were checked to determine how long each student had resided in her current housing situation. It was felt that since the sorority member would be living in the house for the fourth semester that the residence hall junior should have lived in the same hall since the first semester of her sophomore year. Residence hall lists were also checked against previous bid lists and lists of those who had signed up for informal rush in order to identify and eliminate those who had indicated an interest in sorority life.

The sample sizes were based upon the Women's Enrollment Survey, Fall, 1966. At that time there were approximately

282 freshman sorority pledges
1,461 freshman hall residents, excluding pledges
189 junior sorority members residing in sorority houses
539 junior hall residents

It should be noted that not all of these persons would necessarily meet the criteria to be included in a sample.

The sample size set for each group of freshman was set at 125. This represented approximately 40% of the freshman pledges and approximately 10% of the freshman women, excluding pledges, living in the residence halls.

The sample size for each group of juniors was set at 75. This represented approximately 33% of the junior sorority women and 17.5% of the junior residence hall women.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The subjects in each freshman group were identified the second week of the fall semester. A letter was sent out the following week asking those in the sample to participate in the sample. A copy of the letter is included in the appendix as are copies of other notices and reminders which were used. Enclosed was a self-addressed card indicating the times and places the tests would be given.

In order to make the testing as convenient as possible the testing was done in a residence hall cafeteria during regualr study hall hours.

A reminder was sent the day before the testing. Three days later a followup letter was sent out to those who had not responded. Those who did not respond to the second letter and those who did not attend testing when indicating they would do so were contacted by phone. Arrangements were made for those who had conflicts with the scheduled times to take the test on an individual basis.

During the first and second weeks of school the investigator met with sorority presidents and pledge trainers and with residence hall staff members and explained the purpose of the study and procedures which would be used. They were also given copies of the letter which those in the samples would receive. In some instances those who did not respond and could not be contacted by phone were contacted by their pledge trainer or residence hall counselor. All these persons were very helpful in explaining the study and encouraging the student to participate.

In order to facilitate the testing, all items to be administered were assembled in packet form with an information and instruction sheet.

FRESHMAN SAMPLE

	Residence Hall Freshmen	Sorority Pledges
Took first test	125	125
Incomplete packets	3	4
Usable packets	122	121
Withdrew from university	15	2
Eligible to participate in second testing	107	119
Did not want to participate	12	18
Took second test	96	101
Incomplete packets	5	1
Usable packets	91	100
Omitted from sample*	2	4
Final Sample	89	96

*Two from the residence hall group were eliminated as one got married and another pledged a sorority.

Seven of the original 125 sorority pledges depledged during the year. Four participated in the second testing but since they depledged they were eliminated from the study.

JUNIOR SAMPLE

	Residence Hall	Sorority
Participated in testing	75	75
Unusable packets	5	1
Usable packets	70	71

Four residence hall juniors indicated they had signed up to go through rush and had to be replaced.

As all items were untimed, the subject could pick up a packet, read the general instructions and instructions on each item, complete the enclosed items and return the packet. The length of time to complete all items ranged from 45 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes.

An attempt was made to check the items in the packets as they were returned in order to check that all items were completed. This was not possible to do in some instances and in others the check was so rapid that incomplete items went unnoticed. As a result, some subjects were eliminated due to their not completing all the items in the packet.

All those in the original samples who had completed all the test information and who were enrolled second semester were contacted to participate in the re-test. The same procedure was repeated that was used in the original testing. The letter asking their participation was sent out April 15, 1968. Due to the lateness in the semester there were more conflicts in scheduling testing times. Every effort was made to find a time which was at the convenience of the subjects.

Once again explanations of the study were made to sorority pledge trainers and presidents and residence hall staff. The residence hall staff members were very helpful in getting the subjects to participate in the re-testing. In some instances they administered the tests.

The junior women were contacted in April. This was a particularly busy time for many in these groups. As a result more did not participate and had to be replaced through the selection process using the table of random numbers. The same procedure was used in contacting and administering the tests that was used with the freshmen.

Instrumentation

Survey of Interpersonal Values(8)

The Survey of Interpersonal Values is concerned with "critical values involving the individual's relationship to other people or their relationships to him." (p. 3) The SIV porports to measure the degree of importance a person attaches to certain concepts. By determining what a person feels is important one can determine what a person values. The following are descriptions of those concepts which the SIV seeks to determine whether or not a person values (p. 3):

S--Support: Being treated with understanding, receiving encouragement from other people, being treated with kindness and consideration.

C--Conformity: Doing what is socially correct, following regulations closely, doing what is accepted and proper, being a conformist.

R--Recognition: Being looked up to and admired, being considered important, attracting favorable notice, achieving recognition.

I--Independence: Having the right to do whatever one wants to do, being free to make one's own decisions, being able to do things in one's own way.

B--Benevolence: Doing things for other people, sharing with others, helping the unfortunate, being generous.

L--Leadership: Being in charge of other people, having authority over others, being in a position of leadership or power.

These factors were determined through factor analysis.

The instrument which uses a forced choice format consists of thirty sets of triads, each of which contains statements representing three different value dimensions. To reduce the chance that an individual will respond according to favorableness rather than importance the statements within the triad were equated for social desirability.

> The scales are defined by what high scoring individuals value. There are no separate descriptions for low scoring individuals. Low scoring individuals simply do not value what is defined by that particular scale. (p. 3)

Test-retest reliability coefficients for the scales range from .78 to .89. Using the Kuder Richardson formula the resulting range is .71-.86.

Contingency coefficients of .47 to .69 are reported between SIV scores and self-ratings. Congruent validity is evidenced as correlations with the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule show moderate and reasonable overlap.

A research brief cites several studies which report changes in SIV scores when an educational or other type of experience has been interjected.

The authors stress that the SIV should be treated as a research instrument and should be validated in the particular situation in which it will be used.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Form E (26)

The dogmatism scale was developed to measure individual differences in openness and closedness of person's belief system and disbelief system. Dogmatism is used synonymously with "closed" mindedness. The belief-disbelief system "represents each man's total framework for understanding his universe as best he can." (p. 35)

The total is defined as

> ...an organization of verbal and nonverbal, implicit and explicit beliefs, sets, or expectancies. ...the belief system is made up of what a person 'accepts as true of the

world he lives in and the disbelief systems is what he rejects as false at a given time'. (p. 35)

Rokeach's main thesis is that there is an interdependence between the characteristics of the belief system and the open and closed mind. The basic characteristic which determines the degree to which a person's system is open or closed is defined as

> ...the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unemcumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside. (p. 57)

Irrelevant internal pressures include beliefs and perceptual cues, irrational ego motives, power needs, the need for self aggrandizement, the need to reduce anxiety. Irrelevant external pressures refer primarily to pressures of reward and punishment arising from external authority such as parents, peers, reference groups. The more open a person's belief system the more his actions will be "governed by internal actualizing forces and less by irrational inner forces. The more closed a person's system the more dependent he will be on irrelevant internal drives and/or arbitrary reinforcements from external authority. The more closed a person's system the more apt he is to evaluate others in terms of their agreement or disagreement with his own system. The closed system serves as a defense to ward off threat and anxiety by taking in only that which is satisfying. Dogma provides a systematic cognitive framework for rationalizing and justifying one's own actions and feelings of self-righteousness and moral-condemnation of others.

While it might seem that those with relatively open systems should show greater changes than those with closed systems Rokeach states this type of association should not be made. He also cautions against the value judgment that change is socially desirable while non-change is socially undesirable.

The important factor is that both groups should change but in different ways. Both change and absence of change may result from the same underlying motive just as two persons may both share a given attitude but for opposing reasons.

In structuring the instrument each statement had to be designed to transcend specific ideological position in order to penetrate to the formal and structural characteristics of all positions. (p. 72)

The scale is made up of forty items to which the subject responds to on a six point scale ranging +3 to -3; +3 meaning agreement, -3 meaning disagreement. The absence of 0 means no neutral position may be taken. In scoring a +4 is added to each value assigned by the respondent. The lowest possible score is 40 and the highest is 280. Agreement is scored as closed and disagreement as open.

Validity was established through the "known group" method.

Reliabilities as determined by a test-retest method ranged from .68 to .93. For a group of college students at Ohio State University the range was .68 to .85 and for Michigan State University students .78. Rokeach defends the level of reliability on the basis that the scale contains "quite a strange collection of items that cover a lot of territory and on the surface appear to be unrelated to each other. (p. 90)

Grade Point Averages

College grade point averages were obtained from university records. The freshman grade point average was based on the fall semester's grades. A cumulative grade point average through the first semester of the junior year was used for junior women students.

High school grade point averages were based on grades earned from the 9th through the 12th grades. The overall grade average for each student was figured on a 4.0 grading system from the high school transcripts. A high school grade point average of 2.7 is necessary in order to be eligible to attend formal fall rush. Sorority pledges' high school grades were obtained from the Panhellenic Office. The grade point averages were figured in this manner from the residence hall freshmen's transcripts.

The American College Testing Program (ACT)

The ACT serves as a college admissions test administered on a national basis which indicates degree of educational development and potential academic success.

The test yields four subscores--English, mathematics, social studies, and natural science, as well as a composite score.

Description of each test follows:

Test I English Usage Test (80 items, 50 minute test)
Measures the student's educational development in the use of the basic elements of correct and effective writing.

Test II Mathematics Usage Test (40 items, 50 minute test)
Measures the student's educational development in the use of mathematical principle for solving quantitative problems and in the interpretation of graphs and charts.

Test III Social Studies Reading Test (52 items, 40 minutes)
Educational development test measures of the ability to read materials from the social studies

with critical understanding and to do the types of reasoning and problem-solving characteristic of these fields.

Test IV Natural Science Reading Test (52 items, 40 minutes)
Educational development test measures the student's ability to interpret and evaluate reading materials in the natural sciences.

Each score is converted to a common scale which has a mean of approximately 20 and a standard deviation of about 5 for college-bound high school seniors. The scale ranges from 1 (low) to 36 (high).

Reliabilities figured by the Spearman-Brown split-half technique for the four ACT tests vary from .83 to .88.

There are high correlations with between ACT and College Entrance Examination Board-Scholastic Aptitude Test.

Zissis Marriage-Career Rating Scale (41)

This rating scale was developed by C. Zissis in order to determine the career-marriage plans of 550 freshman women at Purdue University in 1959. A pilot study was conducted in 1958 which involved 400 Purdue University freshman women.

The scale uses the following five fold classification plan:

Primarily career
Tend toward career
Career-marriage
Tend toward marriage
Primarily marriage

Activities Surveys

The purpose of the activities survey was to obtain as complete an overview as possible of the student's perception of his participation in extra-curricular activities, the number and type, elected or appointive, of offices held, participation in special interest areas such as drama or music groups and sports activities, the number of special honors and recognitions and the number of queen titles held.

The areas of activities listed on the high school survey were determined by categorizing data from the activities and recognitions section of the rush applications. Major areas of college activities were determined from the university yearbook and also from activities cards which are filled out by the junior women.

A participation score was obtained by assigning a value of 1 to inactive participation, 2 to moderately active, and 3 to active. The sum of the assigned values constituted the participation score.

Size of high school was requested on the high school survey. The categories used were taken from the questionnaire used in the Board of Regent's In and Out of College Study.

Questionnaire: Socio-economic Data

Previous studies indicated that differences in socio-economic background are found between those who pledge and those who do not. The categories used to determine the formal educational level of parents was determined by reviewing the differences found in other studies and by considering the various levels of education used in other studies.

The categories for level of family means were determined by considering the 1960 census report on national income level.

Fathers' occupations were classified according to the "Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries of the United States Bureau of Census, 1950." In instances where mother's occupation was listed rather than father's that occupation was placed in the appropriate category.

This particular classification system was used as it was the system used in the study of "prestige of occupations" conducted by North and Hatt (24). A total of ninety occupations with each class being represented were used to determine how people felt about the general standing of each of the jobs. The occupational titles were then ranked according to the standing. Average prestige scores for major occupational groupings were figured. The average prestige scores are used only as an indicator. North and Hatt cautioned the reader not to accept the scores reported as valid indicators of the prestige levels of the major occupation groups as the assumption that the selected occupations are actually representative of the occupational group is open to question.

Prestige Factors

The questions and factors which one feels leads to high prestige from Dressell and Lehmann's study on Critical Thinking, Attitudes and Values in Education (4).

The questions which are presented are to determine what factor or factors the respondent feels gives a student prestige with faculty and with students and which factor or factors should be important to faculty members and students.

Question two was rephrased in order that it would be appropriate to a freshman group and a junior group.

MEAN SCORES FOR SURVEY OF INTERPERSONAL VALUES

	Support		Conformity		Recognition		Independence		Benevolence		Leadership	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Freshman - Pre-test												
Residence Hall	17.64	4.81	14.33	5.13	11.51	3.92	16.11	6.43	19.51	4.59	10.14	5.52
Sorority	18.88	5.06	13.99	5.24	12.84	4.83	14.33	5.59	19.54	5.35	9.94	6.08
Freshmen - Post Test												
Residence Hall	18.45	4.82	13.07	6.40	11.06	4.74	17.82	6.55	18.85	5.82	9.82	5.31
Sorority	18.46	4.44	12.96	5.57	12.00	4.57	16.71	6.90	18.99	6.27	10.26	5.31
Juniors												
Residence Hall	17.53	4.52	12.71	5.69	11.86	4.99	15.94	5.90	20.23	5.41	11.69	6.15
Sorority	19.49	4.81	12.13	5.28	12.52	4.49	15.61	7.14	17.49	6.62	12.52	7.15
Female Standardization												
Sample	17.8	4.9	14.2	6.2	12.1	4.9	16.2	6.6	18.4	5.7	11.4	6.5

Statistical Analysis

Test for significance for mean differences was run between groups.

To measure change in the freshman groups a "t" for correlated data was used.

Chi square analysis was used to determine significant difference between groups on the following factors:

1. Career-marriage scale
2. Level of parents' education
3. Level of income
4. Occupational classification
5. Size of high school
6. Number of each group (a) holding queen titles; (b) participating in special interest areas

The Mann-Whitney "U" was used to determine differences in participation in high school and college activities and differences in number of offices held.

No tables are included in the draft. All findings which are reported to be significant are significant at least at the .05 level.

Other mean differences are also reported.

Findings

I. Survey of Interpersonal Values

In the fall of the freshman year residence hall women placed a significantly higher value on independence than sorority pledges. At the same time sorority freshmen valued recognition significantly more than the residence hall women.

In looking at mean differences it is noted that sorority pledges placed a higher value on support than residence hall women although not to a significant degree.

By the spring of the year there had been enough shift in mean differences that there no longer existed any significant differences between the two groups on interpersonal values.

Junior residence hall and junior sorority women do differ significantly on the importance they place on support and benevolence. Residence hall women value benevolence to a higher degree while sorority women place a higher degree of importance on support.

In looking at each freshman group in relationship to their upperclass counterpart the most noticeable differences exist between freshman

sorority pledges and junior members. In the fall significant differences exist between the groups on the degree of value placed on conformity, benevolence and leadership with the pledges valuing conformity and benevolence to a higher degree than juniors and leadership to a lesser degree than juniors.

By the end of the year the only significantly difference that existed is the value placed on leadership with freshmen still placing less value on leadership than did juniors.

Residence hall freshmen and juniors show no differences during the fall of the year and in the spring differ significantly only on the value placed on leadership.

During the course of the year the residence hall group changed significantly on conformity and independence. Less importance is placed on conformicy and more importance on independence. Mean scores indicate that a slightly higher degree of importance is placed on support and slightly less on recognition and benevolence.

Sorority freshmen place a significantly higher value on independence and significantly less value on conformity and recognition. Mean scores indicate slightly less importance being placed on benevolence.

In comparison with the means of the standardization sample the following is observed:

1. Sorority women, both freshmen and sophomore, have higher mean scores than the sample. Residence hall women, first semester freshmen and juniors, are just slightly below the sample mean.

2. With the exception of 1st semester residence hall women all groups place a lower value on conformity than the sample group with the sorority women as a group being lower than residence hall women.

3. Entering sorority freshmen and sorority juniors have slightly higher mean scores than the sample group, on recogniton; the residence hall women place a lower value on recognition.

4. Second semester freshmen, both residence hall and sorority, have higher mean scores than the sample on independence. First semester sorority freshmen seem to value independence least of any group.

5. With the exception of sorority juniors all groups have higher mean scores than the standardization sample on benevolence.

6. Junior women have higher mean scores on leadership than the sample group while freshmen have lower.

As the scales are defined by what "high scoring" individuals value, the assumption is made that the scores could be ranked from high mean

scores to low mean scores in order to determine which values are most and least important.

It is interesting to note that when ranked by mean scores all groups with the exception of sorority juniors rank the values in accord with standardization samples. Highest mean scores to lowest for the group placed the values in the following order: benevolence, support, independence, conformity, recognition, and leadership.

Sorority juniors place the highest value on support with benevolence second.

Summary of Findings of Survey of Interpersonal Values

1. When ranking by mean scores benevolence is ranked highest by all groups but sorority juniors who rank it second. Sorority freshmen place significantly higher value on the welfare and concern for others than do sorority junior women; however, by the end of the freshman year while the sorority freshman's mean score is still higher it is not so to a significant degree. The value placed on benevolence by residence hall freshmen remains constant over the year while the mean scores are higher than their junior counterpart, there is no significant difference between the two groups either in the fall or spring.

In considering Robert White's growth trends and the emphasis that is placed on growth and awareness in the area of social concern, it is not surprising that benevolence would be ranked first (38). The mean score of sorority juniors would place it as second in importance to this group is perhaps reflective of the uniqueness of this group. This shall be dealt with in greater detail in discussing support upon which the sorority juniors placed the highest value.

2. Support ranks second in importance when ranked by mean scores by all the groups but sorority juniors who place the most importance on it expected considering the position of the sorority junior. Juniors have assumed leadership functions with their groups. Many, regardless of whether or not they hold major offices, will be instrumental in orienting new members. They are most apt to be more deeply involved. As this involvement occurs they find themselves in a rather curious position which may involve pressures from the group, the alumnae advisory group, the university administration and seniors who now have interests elsewhere and do not care to participate in the group. It is perhaps little wonder that this group placed such importance on "being treated with understanding, receiving encouragement from other people, and being treated with kindness and consideration."

3. Independence is most highly valued by freshmen after they have been in college a while. At the beginning of the year the residence hall women place a significantly higher value on independence. The sorority women place a significantly higher degree of value on independence by the end of the year thus bringing the mean scores of the

two groups closer together. Both freshman groups place a slightly higher value on independence than do their junior counterparts.

While no significant difference exists between the two junior groups mean scores indicate residence hall juniors place a slightly higher value on independence than do sorority juniors.

Katz (16) stated that to many freshmen the sorority served as a "mama." This perhaps provides insight into why sorority pledges initially place less importance on independence. They have someone to tell them when to study, suggest what activities in which to participate. By the end of the year sorority women show a significant increase in the amount of importance placed on independence to the extent that significant differences no longer exist between the two freshman groups or the freshmen and junior sorority women.

4. The mean scores of conformity results in its being ranked fourth by all groups but sorority juniors by whom it is ranked sixth. Both sorority freshmen and juniors placed slightly less value on conformity than their residence hall counterparts. While no significant difference existed between the two residence hall groups, freshmen did have a higher mean score. The mean scores of both freshman groups have moved toward the mean score of the junior groups.

It should be emphasized that conformity is described as "doing what is socially correct, following regulations closely, doing what is accepted and proper." The social emphasis could account for differences. Freshmen do have a greater need for acceptance, for fitting in with the group, thus placing higher value on conformity. Junior sorority women by this time have probably arrived at a greater degree of self-assurance in the area, thus in a triad format it might not seem as significant as one of the other two statements.

5. Recognition is valued most highly by sorority pledges. Pledges place a significantly higher value on being considered important, receiving familiar attention, achieving recognition. While no other significant differences between groups exist it is noted that junior sorority women have a slightly higher mean score than do residence hall women.

6. Leadership placed sixth when ranked according to mean scores. By the end of the year there is a significant difference between residence hall juniors and freshman and sorority juniors and freshmen. In both instances juniors placed a higher value on leadership.

This would be expected considering leadership opportunities available to juniors.

In relationship to the other factors, leadership is valued least. When looking at the mean scores for the Male Standardization Sample it is noted they are ranked in the following order: independence, 19.3; leadership, 17.3; support, 14.9; benevolence, 13.6; recognition, 12.4; conformity, 12.3.

The high value placed on leadership by males and the low value placed on it by females probably reflects differences in role expectations.

Juniors would be in a position to place high value on leadership more than freshmen.

II. Open-mindedness as Measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale Form E

While there is no significant difference between residence hall and sorority freshmen either at the beginning or the end of the year, both groups shift towards more openness. The residence hall freshmen change significantly in the direction of more openness over the course of the year.

While there was no statistically significant difference between residence hall freshmen and juniors, freshmen had a higher mean score than juniors at the beginning of the year and moved to a mean score by the end of the year which was lower than residence hall juniors.

A significant difference existed between sorority freshmen and juniors in the fall semester with the juniors being more open-minded; however, the freshmen changed over the year to the degree that by the end of the year no difference existed between the two groups.

It appears that freshmen become more open-minded as the year progresses.

III. Career-marriage Rating Scale

Responses:

1. Career
2. Tend toward career
3. Career-marriage
4. Tend toward marriage
5. Marriage

No significant difference existed on the career-marriage rating scale between

1. Residence hall and sorority freshmen
2. Residence hall and sorority juniors
3. Residence hall freshmen and juniors
4. Sorority freshmen and juniors

A slightly larger number of sorority freshmen and juniors tend toward marriage than do residence hall freshmen and juniors.

IV. Grade Point Averages

In regard to grade point averages there are significant differences between residence hall women and sorority women. Sorority freshmen had

a significantly higher high school grade point average and first semester grade point average. Junior sorority women have a significantly higher grade point average than residence hall juniors. Between freshmen there is a .36 mean difference and between juniors, a .28 mean difference.

These differences would be expected as grade point average is a criteria used in membership selection.

V. Academic Aptitude

There are no differences between the freshmen and juniors in each group; however, significant differences exist between the residence hall and sorority in the freshman year and the junior year.

Sororities do have access to ACT composite scores. While the ACT composite is taken into consideration not as much emphasis is placed on it as is on high school grade point average.

VI. Prestige Factors

Due to the distribution of the data collected, there was no statistical test appropriate to test the significance of the results.

The presentation of the data in the form of frequency tables and percentages shows that no significant differences exist between the groups as far as prestige factors are concerned.

The subject responded to each of the questions with one of the following factors:

1. Being original and creative
2. Having a pleasing personality
3. Demonstrating scholarly capacity
4. Being active in campus activities
5. Dedicating yourself to your studies
6. Not being too critical
7. Coming from the right social background
8. Being active in varsity activities
9. Being a member of a fraternity or sorority

The tabulated data indicated the following:

Question 1: Which single factor do you feel is the most important with the faculty?

The highest percentage of each of the four groups felt that demonstrating scholarly capacity was most important.

The second highest percentage in each group felt dedicating oneself to one's studies was most important. Being original and creative received the third highest percentage of responses from each group.

Question 2: Which single factor do you think should be most important to faculty?

Residence hall freshmen were fairly evenly divided between dedicating oneself to one's studies, being original and creative, and demonstrating a scholarly capacity.

Being original and creative and demonstrating a scholarly capacity were each considered to be the factor which should be more important by approximately one-third of the group. Dedicating oneself to one's studies received the third highest number of responses.

Residence hall and sorority juniors had the majority of their groups respond that being original and creative or demonstrating a scholarly capacity should be the most important to faculty.

Question 3: What single factor do you think is most important to students?

Over fifty percent of each group indicated that having a pleasing personality is the most important factor to students.

Question 4: What single factor do you think should be most important to students?

About the same percentage of each group felt that having a pleasing personality should be most important to students.

Responses between what is important and what should be important were congruent.

VII. High School Data

There is a significant relationship between sorority or residence hall living and size of high school with sorority pledges tending to come from larger high schools.

While sorority pledges were significantly more involved in high school activities, there was no significant difference between the two groups or the number within each group who held queen titles or who received honors and awards.

VIII. Socio-economic Data

(A) Level of parents' education

There is a significant relationship between sorority and residence hall living for both freshmen and juniors and level of mother's education and level of father's education.

The mothers of more residence hall women than sorority women had a high school education or less while more mothers of sorority pledges attended or graduated from college than did mothers of residence hall freshmen.

The fathers of more residence hall women than sorority women had a high school education or less while more of the fathers of sorority pledges graduated from a college or professional school than did fathers of residence hall freshmen.

No significant relationship existed between freshmen and junior classifications for either sorority or residence hall women and level of parents' education.

(B) Level of Income

Of the sorority pledges 41 out of 96 were not aware of the income of the family while 24 out of 89 of the residence hall freshman women were not aware. As a result, about the only conclusion that can be drawn is that fewer sorority pledges are aware of their family's income than are residence hall freshmen or sorority juniors.

Of those reporting family income, a higher number of residence hall women report family incomes below $9,500 while a higher number of sorority pledges report family incomes of $11,000 or above. The same results occurred between residence hall and sorority junior women. There is a statistically significant relationship between the junior's living group and level of family income.

There is no significant relationship between classification of residence hall women and level of family income.

(C) Father's Occupational Classification

There is a significant relationship between living group affiliation and father's occupation for both freshmen and juniors. A higher percentage of the occupations of fathers of sorority pledges and members fall in the professional and semi-professional and proprietors, managers and officials classifications than do the fathers of residence hall freshmen and juniors.

These two classifications have the highest average prestige scores with 80.6 for professionals and 74.9 for proprietors, managers and officials.

IX. Participation in College Activities

Significant differences exist between residence hall and sorority freshmen and residence hall and sorority juniors. In both instances sorority women participate to a higher degree than do residence hall women.

There is a significant difference between the number of residence hall women and the number of sorority women who participate in special interest areas during the first year. Sorority freshmen participate to a greater extent.

No significant difference exists between the two freshman groups in relationship to the number holding queen titles or the number receiving special honors and awards.

There is a significant difference between the junior groups on involvement in special interests and queen titles held. More sorority women are involved in areas of special interest and do hold more queen titles than do residence hall women.

There is no significant difference between the two groups on honors and awards.

Disposition of Hypotheses

In rejecting or affirming the hypotheses each part which refers to two specific groups will be considered separately.

In considering the interpersonal values the null hypothesis will be rejected if two or more values are found to be significant at the .05 level of significance.

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant differences in interpersonal values and open-mindedness between

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women at the time they enter the university

      Significant differences exist between the two groups on interpersonal values of recognition and independence; however, no significant differences exist between the groups on open-mindedness. The null hypothesis is, therefore, only partially rejected.

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

      The null hypothesis is partially rejected as significant differences exist between the two groups on interpersonal values

of support and benevolence but not on open-mindedness.

c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

Significant differences exist at the beginning of the year between those groups of the interpersonal values of conformity, benevolence, leadership, and open-mindedness. The number of differences which exist result in the null hypothesis being rejected.

d. freshman and junior residence hall women

The null hypothesis is not rejected as no significant differences exist between the two groups.

2. There will be no significant change in interpersonal values and open-mindedness over the academic year for freshman sorority women and for freshman residence hall women.

Significant changes over the year occur in the interpersonal values of conformity and independence and in the degree of open-mindedness for residence hall freshman. Sorority freshmen change significantly on the value placed on interpersonal values of conformity, recognition and independence and in the degree of open-mindedness. The null hypothesis is rejected.

3. There will be no significant difference between the academic aptitude of

a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

There is a significant difference between these two groups on academic aptitude; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

The null hypothesis is rejected as a significant difference did occur between the two groups on academic aptitude.

4. There will be no significant differences between college grade point averages for

a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women as based on the first semester grade average

The null hypothesis is rejected as there is a significant difference between the two groups on grade point average.

b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women as based on their overall grade point average through the first semester of the junior year

A significant difference does exist between the two groups on grade point average which results in the null hypothesis being rejected.

5. Career-marriage plans will not be significantly different between

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

   d. freshman residence hall women and junior residence hall women

   No significant differences occurred between any of the above groups being compared; therefore, in each instance the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

6. Participation in extra-curricular activities will not differ significantly between

   a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   In each of the above comparisons there is a significant difference between the degree of participation in extra-curricular activities; therefore, in each instance the null hypothesis is rejected.

7. There will be no significant differences between the following groups on factors which they feel lead to high prestige of students

   a. freshman sorority women and freshman residence hall women

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

   Data was insufficient in the above comparisons to reject the null hypothesis.

8. Freshman sorority women will not differ significantly from freshman residence hall women on

   a. size of high school graduating class

   b. high school grade point average

   c. participation in high school activities

The null hypothesis is rejected as significant differences occurred between the two groups on all three factors.

9. There will be no significant differences on parents' educational level, family income and prestige of father's occupation between the following groups

   a. freshman sorority pledges and freshman residence hall women

      The null hypothesis is rejected as significant differences between the two groups occur on each of the socio-economic variables.

   b. junior sorority women and junior residence hall women

      Significant differences between the two groups occur on each of the socio-economic variables.

   c. freshman sorority pledges and junior sorority members

      No significant differences are found between the two groups with the exception of family income; therefore, the null hypothesis is only partially rejected.

   d. freshman residence hall women and junior residence hall women

      There are no significant differences between the two groups on the socio-economic variables; therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Butler, W. R. Individual growth in the residence hall program. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1964, 6(1), 12-17.

2. Coffelt, J. J. and Hobbs, D. S. In and Out of College. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1964.

3. Collins, Wanda and Whetstone, R. D. A comparison of sorority and independent women based on retention, academic achievement and scholastic aptitude. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1965, 28, 177-178.

4. Dressell, P. L. and Lehmann, I. J. Critical thinking, attitudes, values in higher education. Cooperative Research Project 372. U.S. Office of Education; Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, 1959.

5. _____. Critical thinking, attitudes, values in higher education. Cooperative Research Project 490. U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, 1959.

6. Eddy, E. D. The College Influence on Student Character. Washington, D. C.; American Council on Education, 1959.

7. Erickson, E. H. Growth and crises of the 'Healthy Personality.' Personality in Nature, Society, Culture. Ed. C. Kluckhorn and H. A. Murray. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

8. Gordon, L. V. Manual for Survey of Interpersonal Values. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1960.

9. Hall, C. S. and Lindzey, G. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.

10. Hartley, Ruth E. Norm compatibility, Norm preference, and the Acceptance of New reference groups. The Journal of Social Psychology, 52:87-95, 1960.

11. _____. Personal needs and the acceptance of a new group as a reference group. The Journal of Social Psychology, 51:349-358, 1960.

12. _____. Relationships between perceived values and acceptance of a new reference group. The Journal of Social Psychology, 51:181-190, 1960.

13. Hyman, Herbert. The Psychology of Status. Archives of Psychology, 1942, 269.

14. Jackson, R. and Winkler, R. C. Comparison of pledges and independents. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43, 1964, 379-382.

15. Jacob, P. E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper Brothers, 1957.

16. Katz, J. and Assoc. No Time for Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

17. Lloyd, B. J. A questionnaire portrait of the freshman coed: easy adjustment. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1965, 28(4), 160-166.

18. Miller, N. D. and Dollard, John. Social Learning and Imitation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

19. Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Chapter VII, "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," pp. 225-280. Chapter IX, "Continuities in the Theory of Reference Groups and Social Structure," pp. 281-386. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

20. Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

21. Plant, W. T. Personality Changes Associated With a College Education. Cooperative Research Branch Project 348. U.S. Office of Education; Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, 1962.

22. _____. Sex, intelligence and sorority or fraternity membership and changes in ethnocentrism over a two year period. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 93, 53-57.

23. Popham, W. J. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967.

24. Reiss, A. J. Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press, 1961.

25. Riker, H. C. College Housing as Learning Centers. The American College Personnel Association, Student Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series No. 3, 1965.

26. Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

27. Sanford, R. N. (Editor) The American College. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1962.

28. _____. Personality developemnt during the college years. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 3-72.

29. _____. Self and Society. New York: Atherton Press, 1966.

30. _____. Where College Fails. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1967.

31. Scott, W. A. Personal values in fraternities and sororities. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. 1965, 28, 187-192.

32. _____. Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1965.

33. Sherif, M. and Sherif, Carolyn. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1965, 541-44.

34. Siegil, S. Nonparametic Statistic for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1956.

35. Stone, S. S. Hellenic affiliation scale. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9(5), 332-333.

36. Sullivan, H. S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1953.

37. Sutherland, R. L., Holtzman, W. H., Koile, E. A., and Smith, B. K. (Editors) Personality Factors On the College Campus: Review of A Symposium. Austin, Texas: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, the University of Texas, 1962.

38. White, R. W. Lives in Progress. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

39. Widmar, G. E. A Comparative Study of Fraternity and Sorority Membership Aspirations of Entering Freshmen at the Florida State University. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

40. Yoshino, R. College drop-outs at the end of the freshman year. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1958, 32, 42-48.

41. Zissis, Cecelia. A Study of the Life Planning of 550 Freshman Women at Purdue University. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1964, 27, 153-159.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRESHMAN RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN AND FRESHMAN SORORITY WOMEN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FRESHMAN YEAR (PRE-TEST) AND AT THE END OF THE FRESHMEN YEAR (POST TEST) ON INTERPERSONAL VALUES AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS

	Freshmen									
	Pre-test					Post test				
	Residence Hall		Sorority			Residence Hall		Sorority		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
Support	17.64	4.81	18.88	5.06	1.697	18.45	4.82	18.46	4.44	.013
Conformity	14.33	5.13	13.99	5.24	.441	13.07	6.40	12.96	5.57	.124
Recognition	11.51	3.92	12.84	4.83	2.059*	11.06	4.74	12.00	4.57	1.379
Independence	16.11	6.43	14.33	5.59	2.013*	17.82	6.55	16.71	6.90	1.112
Benevolence	19.51	4.59	19.54	5.35	.049	18.85	5.82	18.99	6.27	.152
Leadership	10.41	5.52	9.94	6.08	.023	9.82	5.31	10.26	5.31	.493
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	158.27	22.57	156.83	24.26	.416	149.58	24.40	150.10	27.76	.135

df 183
*.05 level of significance

CHANGES OCCURRING DURING THE YEAR WITH RESIDENCE HALL FRESHMEN AND SORORITY FRESHMEN ON INTERPERSONAL VALUES AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS

	Residence Hall Freshmen					Sorority Freshmen				
	Pre-test		Post test			Pre-test		Post test		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
Support	17.64	4.81	18.45	4.82	1.72	18.88	5.06	18.46	4.44	.95
Conformity	14.33	5.13	13.07	6.40	2.76**	13.99	5.24	12.96	5.57	2.27*
Recognition	11.51	3.92	11.06	4.74	1.07	12.84	4.83	12.00	4.57	2.20*
Independence	16.11	6.43	17.82	6.55	2.86**	14.33	5.59	16.72	6.90	4.57**
Benevolence	19.51	4.59	18.85	5.82	1.67	19.54	5.35	18.99	6.27	1.27
Leadership	10.14	5.52	9.82	5.31	.59	9.94	6.08	10.26	6.68	.64
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	158.27	22.57	149.58	24.40	4.23*	156.83	24.26	150.10	27.76	2.69*
			df 88					df 95		

*.05 level of significance
*.01 level of significance
t value = t for correlated data

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESIDENCE HALL AND SORORITY JUNIOR WOMEN ON INTERPERSONAL VALUES AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS

	Residence Hall Juniors		Sorority		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
Support	17.53	4.52	19.49	4.81	2.497*
Conformity	12.71	5.69	12.13	5.28	.636
Recognition	11.86	4.99	12.52	4.49	.830
Independence	15.94	5.90	15.61	7.14	.305
Benevolence	20.23	5.41	17.49	6.62	2.684**
Leadership	11.69	6.15	12.52	7.15	.744
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	152.36	25.21	148.63	21.50	.994

df 139

* .05 level of significance

** .01 level of significance

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRESHMAN RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN AND JUNIOR RESIDENCE HALL WOMEN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR AND THE END OF THE YEAR ON INTER-PERSONAL VALUES AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS

	Residence Hall							
	Freshmen				Juniors			
	Pre Test		Post Test					
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t^1	t^2
Support	17.64	4.81	18.45	4.82	17.53	4.52	.149	1.228
Conformity	14.33	5.13	13.07	6.40	12.71	5.69	.188	.363
Recognition	11.51	3.92	11.06	4.74	11.86	4.99	.497	1.033
Independence	16.11	6.43	17.82	6.54	15.94	5.90	.171	1.874
Benevolence	19.51	4.59	18.85	5.82	20.23	5.40	.911	1.530
Leadership	10.14	5.52	9.82	5.31	11.69	6.15	1.673	2.051*
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	158.27	22.57	149.58	24.40	152.36	25.21	1.557	.701

df 157
*.05 level of significance

t^1 Between freshmen pre-test and juniors

t^2 Between freshmen post test and juniors

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FRESHMAN SORORITY WOMEN AND JUNIOR SORORITY WOMEN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR AND THE END OF THE YEAR ON INTERPERSONAL VALUES AND OPEN-MINDEDNESS

	SORORITY							
	Freshmen				Juniors			
	Pre-test		Post test					
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t^1	t^2
Support	18.88	5.06	18.46	4.44	19.49	4.81	.796	1.436
Conformity	13.99	5.24	12.96	5.57	12.13	5.28	2.260*	.975
Recognition	12.84	4.83	12.00	4.57	12.52	4.49	.439	.734
Independence	14.33	5.59	16.72	6.90	15.61	7.14	1.291	1.016
Benevolence	19.51	4.59	18.99	6.27	17.49	6.62	2.210*	1.489
Leadership	9.94	6.08	10.26	6.68	12.52	7.15	2.519*	2.10 *
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	156.83	24.26	150.10	27.76	148.634	21.496	2.264*	.371

df 165

*.05 level of significance

t^1 Between freshmen pretest and juniors

t^2 Between freshmen post test and juniors

GRADE POINT AVERAGES

	Residence Hall		Sorority		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
Freshmen					
High School Grade Point Average	3.21	.48	3.38	.35	2.64**
df 183					
Freshmen					
College Grade Point Average	2.44	.68	2.79	.58	3.81***
df 183					
Junior					
College Grade Point Average	2.60	.58	2.88	.50	3.10**
df 139					

ACT

	Freshmen		Juniors			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	df	t
Residence Hall	21.07	4.11	21.17	4.09	157	.159
Sorority	22.17	3.74	22.46	3.45	165	.525

ACT

	Residence Hall		Sorority			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	df	t
Freshmen	21.07	4.11	22.17	3.74	183	1.90*
Junior	21.17	4.09	22.46	3.45	139	2.02*

*.05 level of significance

HIGH SCHOOL DATA

Residence Hall and Sorority Freshmen

Size of High School	$x^2 = 16.89^{**}$ df = 4
Number holding queen titles	$x^2 = 2.13$ n.s. df = 1
Number receiving honors and awards	$x^2 = 1.30$ n.s. df = 1

** .05 level of significance

Career - Marriage Rating Scale

Between

Freshmen Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 5.25$ n.s. df = 4
Juniors Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 4.06$ n.s. df = 4
Residence Hall Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 5.70$ n.s. df = 4
Sorority Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 5.21$ n.s. df = 4

n.s. = not significant

LEVEL OF PARENTS EDUCATION

	Mother's Education	Father's Education
Between		
Freshmen Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 14.21^*$ df = 5	$x^2 = 11.68^*$ df = 5
Juniors Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 13.86^*$ df = 5	$x^2 = 21.91^{**}$ df = 5
Residence Hall Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 1.15$ n.s. df = 5	$x^2 = 4.32$ n.s. df = 5
Sorority Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 2.16$ n.s. df = 5	$x^2 = 6.18$ n.s. df = 5

n.s. = not significant

ECONOMIC DATA

	Level of Income	Occupational Classification
Between		
Freshmen Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 12.45$ n.s.[1] df = 6	$x^2 = 9.61$ n.s. df = 6
Juniors Residence Hall and Sorority	$x^2 = 15.09^*$ df = 6	$x^2 = 40.53^{**}$ df = 6
Residence Hall Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 5.55$ n.s. df = 6	$x^2 = 14.44^*$ df = 6
Sorority Freshmen and Juniors	$x^2 = 14.44^*$ df = 6	$x^2 = 11.69$ n.s. df = 6

n.s. = not significant
*.05 level of significance
**.01 level of significance

[1] $x^2 = 12.59$

Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities
Mann Whitney U

Freshmen		
Residence Hall and Sorority		
High school participation	Z	-5.307***
College participation	Z	-7.612***
Juniors		
Residence Hall and Sorority		
College participation	Z	-4.714***

***.001 level of significance